DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 770 CS 503 276

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE Film Attendance: Why College Students Chose to See Their Most Recent Film.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-26, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiences; Behavioral Science Research; *College Students; *Films; Higher Education; *Media Research; Predictor Variables; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; *Student Interests; *Student Reaction
IDENTIFIERS Audience Analysis; *Film Viewing

ABSTRACT

An important issue with regard to film audience is the salience individuals attribute to a variety of film-specific variables which, in turn, determine their particular movie-going experience. This study details the results of an investigation of the importance of 28 potentially influential variables in movie attendance decisions. Respondents to the self-administered questionnaire were students enrolled in randomly drawn classes of a northeastern college. Results indicate that (1) movie-going was rated as "somewhat unimportant" to "indifferent" as a leisure activity; (2) movie attendance was virtually unrelated to the respondents' use of three other media; and (3) the subject matter of the film and the influence of friends were most important to the most recent film attendance experience. As much as 55% of the total variance in movie attendance was accounted for by the variables examined in the study. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199770

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FILM ATTENDANCE: WHY COLLEGE STUDENTS CHOSE TO SEE THEIR MOST RECENT FILM

BRUCE A. AUSTIN

A Paper Presented
to
The Eastern Communication Association Conference
Mass Communication Division
24-26 April 1981
Pittsburgh, PA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bruce A. Austin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Copyright © 1981 by Bruce A. Austin. All rights reserved. This paper is not to be cited without express permission of the author.

CS503276

FILM ATTENDANCE: WHY COLLEGE STUDENTS CHOSE TO SEE THEIR MOST RECENT FILM

While a great deal of thought and effort has been expended on developing, discussing, and explaining aesthetic theories of film (1, 17), little, in contrast, has been directed toward an equally important facet of the medium, the film audience: "In the race between intuition and the IBM machine the latter came in a poor second" (11, p. 304). In 1953 Handel (11, p. 310) noted that "Audience research is well entrenched in all media of mass communication except film" and attributed this, in part, to Hollywood's resistance to such research. Today it is well-known that the industry does conduct research on its audience; however, the exact nature and results of such research remain proprietary.[1] A recent comprehensive bibliography of published research on all aspects of the film audience (3) shows that only 104 empirical studies have been conducted since 1960.[2] Although the quantity of studies might seem impressive, it is hardly so when considered from the perspective of a medium with a nearly one hundred year history. (One might wish to compare the simple frequency of movie audience studies with, for example, those of a much more recent medium, television.) Moreover, the sum contribution of this literature to our understanding of the film audience, may, at best, be described as lacking cohesion and direction.

As has long been recognized - at least since 1948, when the dramatic drop in weekly film admissions began - contemporary movie-goers are far more selective in their film attendance

behavior than were their counterparts when the medium was at its height in popularity. For instance, a 1972 study of Southern Californians, conducted by the Los Angeles Times Marketing Research Department (16), found that nearly three-quarters (73%) of its respondents (teenagers and adults) reported they had decided to see a particular picture before deciding to go to the movies, rather than the other way around (i.e., deciding to go to the movies before deciding which film to see).

An important issue, therefore, with regard to film audiences, which has been largely ignored by social scientists,[3] is the salience individuals attribute to a variety of film-specific variables which, in turn, determine their particular movie-going experience. Thus, this study details the results of an investigation of the importance of 28 potentially influential variables in movie attendance decisions. Based on the concept of a discriminating audience, the research questions this study addresses are:

1. How important is movie-going as a leisure-time activity?
2. What is the relationship between movie attendance and the use of other media?
3. How important were these 28 variables in the individuals' most recent decision to attend a movie and what percentage of the movie attendance variance is predicted by these 28 variables?

The 28 variables considered in this study were selected on the basis of both previous research and intuition. A priori, these 28 variables may be broadly categorized into eight areas: production personnel (director, producer, screenwriter, male and

female stars), production elements (music, photography, title, Motion Picture Association of America rating [G, PG, R, X]), advertising (previews and ads in newspapers, magazines, television, and radio), criticism and reviewing (in newspapers, magazines, TV, and radio), interpersonal influence (from friends and parents), perception of film content (plot and genre), financial costs to the patron (price of admission, proximity of theater, and incidental expenses), and other (nomination for and winning of an Academy Award).

Popular rhetoric, strictly speculative in nature, has asserted the importance of many of these variables in a film's popularity. Gallup, for instance, maintained that a "good" title adds at least $300,000 to a movie's gross (cited in 10, p. 36). Nominations for and, especially, winning of an Oscar, according to Sarris (20, p. 18), has box office impact insofar as the award and the telecasting of the ceremonies act "as a certification of the movies...[the audience is] obliged to catch up on." Beaupre (7, p. 72) goes so far as to state that Coming Home "picked up another $5,189,000 in 1979 by dint of the Academy Awards given its stars, Jane Fonda and Jon Voight." Mayer (18, pp. 37-43) offers a 16-point "popularity factors" sort system (focused mostly on film content) and Jarvie (12) posits that it is a film's "image" which determines success. Finally, five factors which effect film grosses are offered by Munsun (19): film content, the marketing environment, sales effort expended, method of release and distribution, and the effect of initial returns. Based upon conjectural and often contradictory remarks such as those presented above,

our present knowledge of the independent and cumulative contribution of these and other variables is inadequate. Only in the limited scientific literature do we have some sense of the influence of these variables. In a study of British film-goers, Silvey and Kenyon (21) found that the type of film and its cast were the most important reasons for their respondents most recent movie attendance. Production elements (e.g., photography, scripting, direction) were found to be of limited importance. The Los Angeles Times study (16) reported that the film's subject was the most important variable (of a total of 15 variables measured) in determining whether or not to see a particular film. Conversely, the film's title, producer/director, and the results of Academy Awards were viewed as least important.

Several studies, incorporating some of the variables considered here, have been conducted utilizing data generated from non-survey sources. Simonet (22) used the previous experience records of seven production personnel in a multiple regression equation and found that these seven variables accounted for two-thirds of the domestic film revenue variance in top-grossing films. A study which compared audience (as measured by film rentals) response with critics' attention paid to film directors for films in domestic release (24) found virtually no relationship between the two variables. Most recently, Litman's (15) findings contradict those of the Times and Silvey and Kenyon. His study reported that box office success was not dependent on subject matter, attendance restrictions, or "high paid superstars." Variables which were important ingredients, significantly contributing to theatrical

rentals, included the production budget's size, critics' ratings, use of major distributors, Academy Awards, and Christmas release. From this brief review of the available literature it is apparent that contradictions are rife. Thus, in addition to the research questions offered above, this study will attempt to resolve some of these differences. Moreover, the present research eschews the methodological pitfalls of both the armchair philosophers and the non-survey scholars.

METHODOLOGY

Respondents to the self-administered questionnaire used for this study were students enrolled in randomly drawn classes of a northeastern college.[4] A total of 318 questionnaires were distributed of which 170 (53.4%) were returned. Participants were asked to complete the anonymous questionnaire at home. Distribution and collection of the questionnaires occurred in December, 1979.

The questionnaire used in this study was designed to assess the respondents' frequency of movie attendance and the importance of the 28 variables in their most recent film-going experience. In order to determine most recent film attendance, the respondents were asked to record the title of the last movie they had seen as well as "who or what drew your attention to the film." Following these two open-ended questions, the participants were directed to indicate their opinion concerning the importance of each of the 28 variables in their attendance decision on a seven-point rating scale. Response options ranged from "very unimportant"

(coded 1) to "very important" (coded 7).

Respondents ranged in age from 17 to 35 years ($\bar{X}$ = 20.7 years, Md = 20.4 years). Distribution by sex closely matched the population from which the sample was drawn: 68.9% were males and 31.1% females. The participants academic class status was as follows: 27.5% freshmen, 16.2% sophomores, 22.2% juniors, 32.3% seniors, and 1.8% graduate and nonmatriculated. The sample was subdivided into two groups, frequent and occasional movie-goers. Frequent movie-goers were defined as those respondents who reported attending films twice a month or more. The distribution of the respondents by sex and year in school for these two groups is displayed in Table 1. There was no significant difference between the two groups by age (X^2 = 16.72, df = 13, p = .21).

Table 1 About Here

Before presenting the results of this study it is important to address the concept of external validity, the representativeness of the sample. Gertner (9, p. 32A) reports that 58% of the total 1977 film admissions were accounted for by 16 to 29 year olds. Moreover, individuals with at least some college education comprise both the largest and most frequent movie-going aggregate. Thus, as Elliott and Schenck-Hamlin (8, p. 553) state, "for film research, the college student may be more representative than student samples used in other research." The usual cautions concerning self-reported data are, of course, applicable.

RESULTS

For the entire sample the mean frequency of movie attendance was once a month. Table 2 reports responses to a question which

---

Table 2 About Here

---

asked, "When are you most likely to go to a movie?" The most frequently occurring response among all groups offers support for the findings reported by the 1972 Times study and the concept of a discriminating audience: movie-going appears to be a specific - as opposed to a general - activity. These respondents to go a movie, not the movies. Knowing this, as well as that film patrons in this market have a multitude of films from which to choose,[5] we should be able, from the importance attributed to the variables examined in this study, to better understand how film-goers arrive at their choice for film attendance.

Sixty-five different titles were listed by the respondents as the last movie they had seen. Three films were mentioned by more than ten respondents: Apocalypse Now, 10, and Animal House. Responses to the question which asked who or what drew their attention to this film were coded into six categories. Table 3 reports the percentage distribution by type of response for both

---

Table 3 About Here

---

groups. While overall there is no significant difference between groups, frequent movie-goers more often mentioned word-of-mouth

sources than did occasional movie-goers.

The first research question asked: How important is movie-going as a leisure-time activity? To address this question, respondents were asked: "In terms of your leisure-time activities, about how important would you say going to the movies is?" On a seven-point scale (1 = very unimportant) the mean response for the entire sample was 3.7, for occasional movie-goers, 3.4, and for frequent movie-goers, 4.2. Although neither group evaluated movie-going as an important leisure-time activity, as would be expected, frequent movie-goers rated the activity as significantly more important than occasional patrons ($t=4.323$, $df=161$, $p<.001$, two-tailed). A following, open-ended,question asked the respondents to indicate their favorite leisure-time activity. Twenty-six different types of responses were coded. Overall, 2.5% of the sample reported going to the movies as their favorite leisure-time activity, with .9% among the occasional and 6.0% among the frequent attenders. By way of comparison, the 1972 Times study reported that 2% of its sample named movie-going as their favorite leisure activity.

Another aspect of movie-going as a leisure activity is media use in general. Handel's 1946 study (cited in 10, p. 155) reported positive correlations between attendance at movies, radio listening, and newspaper and book reading. The second research question asked: What is the relationship between movie attendance and the use of other media? Table 4 reports

---

Table 4 About Here

---

product-moment correlations between movie attendance, daily television viewing, and (daily) newspaper and (monthly) magazine reading. As can be seen, for the entire sample as well as the two subgroups, movie attendance was unrelated to televiewing and newspaper reading. A modest (.19) positive relationship between film-going and magazine reading was found, but only for the sample as a whole. These findings, then, tend to contradict Handel's assertion of a multimedia-use audience. In terms of the extent of their media consumption, both occasional and frequent film-goers reported viewing an average one-to-two hours of television daily ($t=.127$, $df=165$, $p > .05$, two-tailed) and reading a newspaper an average of three times weekly ($t=.980$, $df=165$, $p > .05$, two-tailed). Frequent film-goers reported reading significantly more magazines monthly ($t=9.813$, $df=165$, $p < .001$, two-tailed) than did occasional movie-goers (an average of three a month compared to two a month respectively).

The third research question asked: How important were these 28 variables in the individuals' most recent decision to attend a movie and what percentage of the movie attendance variance is predicted by these 28 variables? Table 5 presents the mean scores and comparative rank order by attendance group for each

---

Table 5 About Here

---

variable. As was found in studies by the Times, Austin (2), and Silvey and Kenyon, the two most important variables, among both groups, were the film's plot and genre, i.e., its subject matter. Comments made by friends were also clearly important. Conversely,

the three least important variables were behind-the-camera production personnel: the film's director, writer, and producer. This finding, too, tends to agree with previous research (2, 16, 21). In contrast with the popular rhetoric, winning or being nominated (a better indicator here given the time of questionnaire distribution) for an Academy Award was reported by these respondents to be rather unimportant. Other low-salience variables included parental comments, MPAA rating, and incidental costs.

Advertisements presented in the electronic media were rated as more important than those offered by the print media; of all four media examined, television was by far the more important medium. Compared to these media advertisements, previews (trailers) shown in theaters were more important than were ads presented in radio, newspapers, or magazines. Frequent movie-goers ranked previews higher than did occasional movie-goers (fourth and seventh respectively), as would be expected given their greater likelihood of exposure to such promotional material.

While the electronic media were rated as more important advertising sources than were print media, reviews which appeared in print were ranked higher than those presented on TV or radio. Occasional movie-goers rated reviews as being more important than did frequent movie-goers, regardless of the medium in which they were presented. Nevertheless, overall, critical commentary was assessed as being somewhat unimportant to those respondents.

To check for differences by attendance group and sex for each criterion available, two-way analysis of variance tests were performed.[6] One significant interaction effect was found: occasional female film-goers reported proximity of the theater

as significantly more important than did males ($p < .05$). In terms of attendance group, a significant main effect was found only for the newspaper reviews variable: occasional film-goers rated this variable as significantly more important than frequent film-goers ($p < .05$). Three significant main effects were found when the variables were compared by sex. In all three instances males reported the director ($p < .05$), producer ($p < .05$), and TV advertisements ($p < .01$) more important than females.

As Table 5 illustrates, the price of admission ranked fifth and eleventh in importance for, respectively, the occasional and the frequent film-goer. Later in the questionnaire the participants were asked to respond on a seven-point scale (1=strongly disagree) to the following statement: "If the price of admission (tickets) to the movies was less expensive I would go more often." The mean response for both attendance groups indicated agreement with this statement (occasional $\bar{X}=5.9$, frequent $\bar{X}=5.97$). The similarity of mean values for both groups suggests that while the price of admission was a relatively unimportant variable for their last trip to the movies, lower prices at the box office might stimulate increased frequency of attendance.

To provide an answer to the question concerning what percentage of the movie attendance is predicted by these 28 variables, the variables examined here, plus a 29th, importance of movie attendance as a leisure activity, were entered by forward stepwise inclusion in a multiple regression analysis with movie attendance as the dependent variable. In the stepwise regression procedure, the most powerful independent variable (i.e., that variable which explains the greatest amount of variance in the dependent variable)

is entered first, followed by the remaining independent variables according to the strength of their contribution to variance explained in the dependent variable. As Jennrich (13, p. 58) notes, the stepwise routine allows the researcher to "steer the [predictor variable] additions by statistically meaningful criteria." Here the criteria utilized were: n in predictor list=29, F=.01, and tolerance=.001.

Overall, for the total sample, somewhat more than one-quarter (R^2=28.6) of the movie attendance variance is explained by 27 variables (film plot and magazine advertisements' F-level were insufficient for inclusion).[7] The summary portion of the regression analysis for occasional film-goers is presented in Table 6 while Table 7 reports the results for frequent movie-goers.

Table 6 About Here

Table 7 About Here

Using 27 variables (insufficient F-levels for the television reviews and Oscar nomination variables), 35.4% of the variance is explained for the occasional attendance group. Excluding the importance of movie-going the R^2 drops to 32.6% for this group. As can be seen in Table 7, 27 variables (radio reviews and parents' comments not included) predict more than half - 55.1% - of the variance for the frequent attendance group. With movie-going importance excluded, R^2=52.5%

CONCLUSION

This report presents the results of a study which investigated the importance of 28 variables in an individual's most recent decision to attend a film. Based on the three research questions offered earlier, the following conclusions may be drawn: (1) movie-going was rated as somewhat unimportant to indifferent as a leisure-time activity, (2) movie attendance was found to be virtually unrelated to the respondents' use of three other media, (3) the subject matter of the film and the influence of friends were most important to the respondents most recent film attendance experience; conversely, the three key behind-the-camera production personnel and individuals outside the respondents' peer group were assessed as being unimportant, (4) as much as 55% of the total variance in movie attendance is accounted for by the variables examined in this study, thereby indicating their use by movie-goers.

The study reported here offers numerous avenues for further investigation. Film audience research, despite the lengthy existence of the medium and patrons, is still in its infancy. One might, for instance, logically and validly argue that the influence of virtually all the various production variables on film choice decisions is contingent on sources external to the variables themselves (e.g., interpersonal or mass mediated) and hence these variables might be viewed as contaminated.[8] Thus, for example, the influence of film plot or genre is probably dependent on interpersonal interaction, reading of reviews, viewing advertisements, or seeing trailers, since one cannot

possibly have first-hand knowledge of plot or genre prior to actually viewing a film. Further, the concept of film genres and what this means to individuals continues to confound research efforts.[9] There is obviously a need, therefore, for research that goes beyond bivariate analysis and which attempts to sort-out by multivariate means these sources of contamination. Moreover, different advertising (e.g., the early enigmatic ads for The China Syndrome as opposed to reliance on reputation as has been employed for The Empire Strikes Back, Rocky II, and Jaws - "Just when you thought it was safe to go back in the water" - II) and marketing strategies and their effectiveness need research attention.

TABLE 1

Distribution by Sex and Year in School of Occasional and Frequent Movie-Goers

	Occasional Movie-Goers	Frequent Movie-Goers
Male	67.2%	75.5%
Female	32.8%	24.5%
N	116	49
	$x^2 = 1.13$ df=1	$p > .05$
Freshman	25.0%	33.3%
Sophomore	16.4%	15.7%
Junior	22.4%	21.6%
Senior	34.5%	27.5%
Graduate and Other	1.7%	1.9%
N	116	51
	$x^2 = 1.52$ df=4	$p > .05$

TABLE 2

When Are You Most Likely To Go To A Movie?

	Total Sample	Occasional Movie-Goers	Frequent Movie-Goers
When you feel tired or depressed	.6%	.9%	.0%
When you just happen to have a free evening	8.8%	8.5%	9.6%
When there is a picture which especially interests you	76.5%	73.7%	82.7%
When someone else asks you to go	8.8%	11.0%	3.9%
Other	5.3%	5.9%	3.8%
		$X^2 = 3.27$ df=4 p=.51	

TABLE 3

Who or What Drew Your Attention To The Last Film You Attended?

	Occasional Movie-Goers	Frequent Movie-Goers
Word-of-mouth	33.3%	48.0%
Theme/content	26.3%	16.0%
Actor/actress	16.7%	12.0%
TV advertisement	12.3%	10.0%
Reviews	6.1%	4.0%
Other	5.3%	10.0%
N	113	50

$X^2 = 5.74$ df=5 $p > .05$

TABLE 4

Product-Moment Correlations of Media Use Habits

	TV Viewing	Newspaper Reading	Magazine Reading
Movie Attendance			
total sample	.00	-.05	.19*
occasional	.00	.04	.08
frequent	.07	.02	.00
TV Viewing			
total sample		.22**	.12
occasional		.27**	.13
frequent		.09	.12
Newspaper Reading			
total sample			.26***
occasional			.26***
frequent			.31*

*p < .05 (two-tailed)
**p < .01 (two-tailed)
***p < .001 (two-tailed)

TABLE 5

Mean Scores and Rank-Order For Importance of Movie Attendance Variables

	Total Sample		Occasional Movie-Goers		Frequent Movie-Goers	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Plot	5.59	(1)	5.52	(1)	5.66	(1)
Genre	5.21	(2)	5.09	(2)	5.36	(2)
Friends' Comments	4.99	(3)	5.00	(3)	4.82	(3)
TV Ads	4.10	(4)	4.17	(4)	3.86	(5)
Previews	3.80	(5)	3.63	(7)	4.08	(4)
Title	3.71	(6)	3.69	(6)	3.68	(6)
Price of Admission	3.63	(7)	3.72	(5)	3.26	(11)
Male Star	3.61	(8)	3.62	(8)	3.50	(9)
Female Star	3.36	(9)	3.18	(12)	3.66	(7)
Radio Ads	3.35	(10)	3.42	(9)	3.10	(12)
Color Photography	3.31	(11)	3.17	(13)	3.52	(8)
Music	3.27	(12)	3.15	(14)	3.44	(10)
Newspaper Reviews	3.25	(13)	3.41	(10)	2.80	(16)
Magazine Reviews	3.14	(14)	3.28	(11)	2.74	(17)
Proximity of Theater	3.12	(15)	3.09	(15)	2.98	(14)
Newspaper Ads	3.07	(16)	3.05	(16)	3.00	(13)
Magazine Ads	2.97	(17)	2.93	(18)	2.92	(15)
TV Reviews	2.92	(18)	2.95	(17)	2.64	(19)
MPAA Rating	2.86	(19)	2.82	(19)	2.92	(15)
B&W Photography	2.82	(20)	2.77	(20)	2.74	(17)
Radio Reviews	2.64	(21)	2.66	(21)	2.48	(21)
Oscar Nomination	2.63	(22)	2.52	(22)	2.68	(18)
Oscar Winning	2.59	(23)	2.52	(22)	2.62	(20)
Incidental Costs	2.29	(24)	2.21	(23)	2.34	(22)
Parents' Comments	2.22	(25)	2.19	(24)	2.24	(23)
Producer	1.92	(26)	1.84	(25)	2.12	(24)
Writer	1.82	(27)	1.80	(26)	1.86	(25)
Director	1.76	(28)	1.74	(27)	1.74	(26)

1=very unimportant, 7=very important

TABLE 6

Summary Table for Stepwise Regression with Movie Attendance as the Dependent Variable: Occasional Movie-Goers

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R^2	Simple r	Beta
Movie importance	0.29	0.087	0.29	0.19
Director	0.35	0.128	0.24	0.28
B&W photo	0.39	0.159	0.17	0.19
Parents' comments	0.42	0.178	-0.03	-0.20
Radio reviews	0.44	0.200	0.22	0.41
Male star	0.46	0.218	0.22	0.26
Newspaper ads	0.48	0.237	0.08	-0.22
Oscar winner	0.50	0.253	-0.01	-0.21
Previews	0.51	0.264	0.22	0.20
TV ads	0.53	0.281	-0.03	-0.12
Writer	0.54	0.291	0.09	-0.12
Title	0.54	0.299	0.17	0.13
Producer	0.55	0.306	0.11	-0.15
Newspaper reviews	0.56	0.314	0.12	-0.07
Magazine ads	0.56	0.322	0.10	0.23
Genre	0.57	0.330	0.03	-0.13
MPAA rating	0.57	0.334	-0.03	-0.08
Incidental costs	0.58	0.337	0.05	-0.06
Radio ads	0.58	0.341	0.05	-0.10
Magazine reviews	0.58	0.343	0.12	-0.07
Friends comments	0.58	0.345	0.11	0.08
Female star	0.58	0.347	0.06	-0.08
Plot	0.59	0.349	-0.06	-0.05
Music	0.59	0.351	0.09	0.06
Theater proximity	0.59	0.352	0.00	0.06
Price of admission	0.59	0.353	-0.04	-0.04
Color photo	0.59	0.354	0.14	-0.04

TABLE 7

Summary Table for Stepwise Regression with Movie Attendance as the Dependent Variable: Frequent Movie-Goers

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R^2	Simple r	Beta
Female star	0.26	0.069	-0.26	-0.29
MPAA rating	0.41	0.168	0.10	0.27
TV ads	0.48	0.232	-0.10	-0.16
Newspaper reviews	0.51	0.262	0.12	0.20
Oscar winner	0.54	0.296	-0.08	-0.07
Producer	0.57	0.330	0.07	0.18
Magazine ads	0.63	0.404	-0.20	-0.44
Incidental costs	0.65	0.425	-0.14	-0.28
Male star	0.66	0.448	-0.19	-0.17
Movie importance	0.68	0.469	0.21	0.27
Newspaper ads	0.69	0.482	0.12	0.17
Writer	0.70	0.502	0.10	0.20
Color photo	0.71	0.511	0.10	0.33
B&W photo	0.72	0.519	-0.06	-0.23
Genre	0.72	0.531	0.00	-0.11
Friends' comments	0.73	0.536	-0.05	-0.12
Previews	0.73	0.540	-0.12	0.15
Radio ads	0.73	0.542	0.04	0.09
Oscar nomination	0.73	0.544	-0.01	-0.24
Director	0.73	0.546	0.00	0.09
Plot	0.73	0.547	0.02	-0.07
Theater proximity	0.74	0.549	-0.08	-0.02
TV reviews	0.74	0.549	0.02	0.12
Title	0.74	0.549	0.22	0.07
Price of admission	0.74	0.550	-0.01	-0.04
Magazine reviews	0.74	0.551	0.00	-0.07
Music	0.74	0.551	-0.16	-0.04

FOOTNOTES

[1]For a discussion of recent trends in research conducted by the film industry see Simonet (23).

[2]Bannerman and Lewis (6, p. 129) note that "Scholarly interest in the movies [sic] audience has waned greatly since the advent of television and recent studies are scarce."

[3]The relationship between film and its audience has been a perennial focus of attention for the methodologically less rigorous armchair philosophers. These individuals, termed "Descriptors" by Austin (4), while often providing valuable points of departure for the social scientist, offer little in the way of systematically and empirically advancing the state of knowledge.

[4]Copies of the questionnaire are available from the author. The present research builds upon a pilot study (2).

[5]As advertised in the market's local daily newspaper at the time when the study was conducted, there was a total of 24 indoor theaters and 36 screens.

[6]Due to space limitations, tables reporting the results of these tests are not shown. Copies of the tables are available from the author.

[7]Excluding importance of movie-going from the analysis, R^2=17.5. The summary table for this analysis is not shown due to space limitations but is available from the author.

[8]Nonetheless, it is sensible to assume that even though some degree of contamination is to be expected, the production variables may still be differentially salient to various individuals. Therefore, while the contribution of who directed a film to subsequent attendance is most likely to be determined by reading advertisements listing such credits, the importance of the variable to different individuals is likely to fluctuate.

[9]For a discussion of this point see (5) and (14).

REFERENCES

1. Andrew, J. Dudley. The Major Film Theories: An Introduction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

2. Austin, Bruce A. "Motion Picture Attendance and Factors Influencing Movie Selection Among High School Students." Paper presented to the 33rd Annual Conference of the University Film Association, August 1979, Ithaca, New York (available in ERIC, ED 177 630).

3. Austin, Bruce A. "Film Audience Research, 1960-1980: An Annotated Bibliography." Journal of Popular Film and Television 8 (2), 1981, pp. 53-60.

4. Austin, Bruce A. "Rating the Movies." Journal of Popular Film and Television 7 (4), 1980, pp. 384-399.

5. Austin, Bruce A. "Portrait of a Cult Film Audience: The Rocky Horror Picture Show." Unpublished manuscript (1980), available from the author.

6. Bannerman, Julia and Jerry M. Lewis. "College Students' Attitudes Toward Movies." Journal of Popular Film 6 (2) 1977, pp. 126-139.

7. Beaupre, Lee. "Grosses Gloss: Breaking Away at the Box-Office." Film Comment 16 (2), March-April 1980, pp. 69-73.

8. Elliott, William R. and William J. Schenck-Hamlin, "Film, Politics and the Press: The Influence of 'All the President's Men.'" Journalism Quarterly 56 (3), Autumn 1979, pp. 546-553.

9. Gertner, Richard Ed.). Motion Picture Almanac 1980. New York: Quigley Publishing Co., 1980.

10. Handel, Leo A. Hollywood Looks at its Audience. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950.

11. Handel, Leo A. "Hollywood Market Research." The Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 7, Spring 1953, pp. 304-310.

12. Jarvie, I. C. Movies and Society. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

13. Jennrich, Robert I. "Stepwise Regression." In Kurt Enslein, Anthony Ralston, and Herbert S. Wilf (Eds.). Statistical Methods for Digital Computers, vol. 3. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

14. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Audience Research in the Movie Field." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 254, November 1947, pp. 160-168.

15. Litman, Barry R. "An Empirical Analysis of Theatrical Movie Popularity." Paper presented to the 10th Annual Popular Culture Association Conference, April 1980, Detroit, Michigan.

16. Los Angeles Times. A Look at Southern California Movie-Going, 1972.

17. Mast, Gerald and Marshall Cohen (Eds.). Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

18. Mayer, Michael F. The Film Industries, 2nd ed. New York: Hastings House, 1978.

19. Munsun, Chris. "The Marketing of Motion Pictures." Unpublished D.B.A. thesis, University of Southern California, 1969.

20. Sarris, Andrew. "Academy Leaders." Film Comment 16 (2), March-April 1980, pp. 15-18.

21. Silvey, Robert and Judy Kenyon. "Why You Go to the Pictures." Films and Filming 11, June 1965, pp. 4-5, 36.

22. Simonet, Thomas S. "Regression Analysis of Prior Experiences of Key Production Personnel as Predictors of Revenues from High-Grossing Motion Pictures in American Release." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1977.

23. Simonet, Thomas. "Market Research: Beyond the Fanny of the Cohn." Film Comment 16 (1), January-February 1980, pp. 66-69.

24. Simonet, Thomas and Kenneth Harwood. "Popular Favorites and Critics' Darlings Among Film Directors in American Release, 1930-1971." Paper presented to the Society for Cinema Studies Conference, March 1977, Evanston, Illinois.